क्षेत्र/राज्य/प्रणाली	से सहायता	सहायता अप्रैल, जनवरी, 1998, 1999
दक्षिणी क्षेत्र		
आंध्र प्रदेश	गोवा (प॰ क्षे॰)	26.3
	गुजरात (प॰ क्षे॰)	167.7
	मध्य प्रदेश (प॰ क्षे॰)	108.7
	महाराष्ट्र (प॰ क्षे॰)	19.5
	पूर्वी क्षेत्र	588.3
कर्नाटक	गोवा (प॰ क्षे॰)	3.3
	गुजरात (प॰ क्षे॰)	9.2
	महाराष्ट्र (प॰ क्षे॰)	684.3
केरल	गोवा (प॰ क्षे॰)	1.5
	गुजरात (प॰ क्षे॰)	5.1
	महाराष्ट्र (प॰ क्षे॰)	5.5
केरल	पूर्वी क्षेत्र	258.3
तमिलनाडु	पूर्वी क्षेत्र	295.2
	गोवा (प॰ क्षे॰)	5.4
	गुजरात (प॰ क्षे॰)	13.2
	महाराष्ट्र (प॰ क्षे॰)	130.2
	पंजाब (उ॰ क्षे॰)	136.6
जोड़		2458.3
पूर्वी क्षेत्र		
बिहार	असम (उ॰पू॰क्षे॰)	0.8
डी॰वी॰सी॰	एन टी पी सी (औरैया)-उ॰क्षे॰	3.7
	एन टी पी सी (दादरी-टी वी एस) उ॰क्षे॰	11.2
डी॰वी॰सी॰	असम-उ॰पू॰क्षे॰	3.2
उड़ीसा	आई सी सी एल	198.8
	नाल्को	769.6
पश्चिम बंगाल	असम-उ॰पू॰क्षे॰	7.0
जोड़		994.3
उत्तर-पूर्वी क्षेत्र		
असम	मेघालय	56.4
मणिपुर	पूर्वी क्षेत्र	302.2
	मेघालय	26.4
जोड़		385.0

टिप्पणी:- प॰क्षे॰ पश्चिमी क्षेत्र
उ॰क्षे॰ उत्तरी क्षेत्र
पू॰क्षे॰ पूर्वी क्षेत्र
उ॰पू॰क्षे॰ उत्तर-पूर्वी क्षेत्र

CAG report regarding CAPART

1661. SHRI JALALUDIN ANSARI:
SHRI GAYA SINGH:

Will the Minister of RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether A Comptroller and Auditor-General (CAG) report has accused the Council for Advancement of People's Action and rural Technology (CAPART), of being caught in a tangle of corruption and inefficiency; and

(b) if so, the details and action being taken, if any, in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI BABAGOUDA PATIL): (a) The C & AG in his report (No. 4 of 1998) which was presented to Parliament on 11th June, 1998 has made observations on irregulatities in the sanctioning of projects, release of funds, monitoring etc. by the Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART).

(b) Details of observations included in the C & AG's report are given in the statement. (*See below*)

So far CAPART has taken the following action:—

(i) 89 show cause notices have been issued to the concerned voluntary organisations.

(ii) Cases of nine officials have been closed as no irregularity was fund on their part.

(iii) Warning has been issued to ten officials.

(iv) Minor penalty/censure has been imposed on four officials.

(v) Five increments have been stopped in respect of one official.

(vi) Disciplinary proceedings have been instituted against four officials.

Statement

Para No.	List of observations of C&AG
25.7.1	Mandatory requirement as per the guidelines has not been observed prior to sanction of projects.
25.7.2	Receipt of Monitors reports is not watched.
25.7.4.1	Sanction of project before completion of the monatory period of 3 years, release of 2 instaiments without midterm evaluation.
25.7.4.2	Funds rereased without obtaining the acceptance of terms and conditions of the projects which was the pre-requisite for release of funds. Although, while releasing last instalments, it was order for evaluation report from district Collector regarding annancement of cest and find progress of project no such report was called for.
25.7.4.3	4 projects were sanctioned to a Chat Shop owner in Patna between February 1992 and September 1993. The chat Shop owner refused to make available any papers of the projects to the monitors. No action to recover the money was taken.
25.7.4.4	Not calling for problem village certificate from the State PH&D at the stage of clearance of the proposal, an essential pre-requisite in drinking water resulted in duplication of work.
25.8.3	* Release of funds without verifying the status of the organisation
	* Favours shown to voluntary organisation
	* Release of second and final instalment without calling for documents
	* Issue of sanction without approval of the DG
	* Deficiencies pointed out by monitor not brought out in the official notes and funds recommened for release.
Appendix-XIII Sl. No. 1	Projects sanctioned without reference to earlier on going projects.
Sl. No. 2	Contrary to the instructions of the DG for release of funds in 4 instalments releases were made in 2 instalments by misrepresenting facts in the officials notes.
Sl. No. 3	Land did not belong to VO which was not brought out by the officer of CAPART who evaluated the project.
Sl. No. 6	Funds released without prefunding appraisal ordered by DG.
Sl. No. 8	2 projects were sanctioned to the VO within a gap of 3 days concealing the fact to avoid sanction of DG.
Sl. No. 9	Society registered for educational activity was sanctioned a project.
Sl. No. 16	Second instalment was released without mid-term evaluation.
Sl. No. 17	Evaluation was done by monitor who was not authorised by competent authority.
25.7.4.5	Although a VO was placed under doubtful category, 5 projects were sanctioned to the VO within 2 years. Last project was sanctioned without a project report.

25.7.4.6 Director recommended 2 projects by linking them with 2 projects sanctioned earlier circumventing the need for fresh proposal.

25.7.4.7 Project was sanctioned to the VO without any project proposal by linking it with an earlier project which was also evaluated by the same Director and without registration certificate, bye-laws of the organisation, list of villages etc.

25.7.4.8 Project was sanctioned to a Bihar based VO on the basis of favourabler funding report of the Monitor which was found non-existent.

25.7.4.9 3 organisations which were working under one individual were sanctioned projects.

25.7.4.10 Funds were released in 3 installments between June 1993 to December 1993 without receipt of progress reports.

25.7.4.11 Projects were sanctiond to a VO on the basis of prefunding report prepared by Council's own Director who vouched the credibility of the VO during his personal visit of Bihar.

25.8 Pariodical progress reports/ completion reports were not obtained as a result 92% of the projects were found to be shown as incomplete though 95% of the projects sanctioned were of a short duration of 6 months to 1 year.

25.8.2 "Nexus between officials of the Council including monitors in cheating, forgery, criminal conspiracy and misappropriation of Government funds".

Allocation of funds to Uttar Pradesh for construction of roads

1662. SHRI MUNAVVAR HASAN: Will the Minister of RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the total funds allocation to Uttar Pradesh for construction of roads during the last three years, year-wise;

(b) the number of villages in Azamgarh, Mau and Mujaffarnagar districts of Uttar Pradesh which have been connected by roads; and

(c) the number of villages in Azamgarh, Mau and Mujaffarnagar district likely to be connected by roads?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI BABAGOUDA PATIL)

(a) a total amount of Rs. 1,790.57 Crores was allocated to Uttar Pradesh for construction of roads during the last three years, i.e., Rs. 416.46 in 1995-96, Rs. 498.01 in 1996-97 and Rs. 876.10 in 1997-98.

(b) and (c) Roads in a State subject. The State Governments are responsible for the construction and maintenance of roads. The Government of India does not monitor the district-wise coverage of villages connected by roads.

Amount released to Assam for RD Projects

1663. SHRI KARNENDU BHATTACHARJEE: Will the Minister of RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) how much amount has been given by the Central Government to Assam Government in 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99, upto 28th February, 1999 for projects to be taken up under D.R.D.A., like J.R.Y., M.W.S. and E.A.S.;

(b) the amount spent by the D.R.D.A., Silchar in respect of above schemes during the same period;

(c) whether Government are aware of misappropriation of funds and corrupt practices indulged into by D.R.D.A., Silchar; and